

## REMARKS

In response to the Office Action dated November 24, 2003, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration based on the following remarks. Applicant respectfully submits that the claims as presented are in condition for allowance.

The Abstract was objected to and has been amended to address the item raised by the Examiner.

Claims 1-4, 7-14 and 17-18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Nuding in view of Taira. This rejection is traversed for the following reasons.

Claim 1 recites "each receive branch network includes a receive filter passing a block of frequencies to a base receiver, the block of frequencies corresponding to hopping channels inside a passband of said receive filter; said hopping channels used to change a frequency of communication between a mobile station and said base station receiver." Nuding teaches receivers E1-En that employ circulators and filters, but does not disclose filtering a block of frequencies corresponding to hopping channels as recited in claim 1. In fact, Nuding teaches that the filters are tuned to a narrow frequency band (column 2, lines 41-44). Taira was relied upon for disclosing an isolator between an antenna and a transmitter path but fails to teach filtering a block of frequencies corresponding to hopping channels as recited in claim 1. Thus, even if Nuding and Taira are combined, the invention of claim 1 does not result.

For the above reasons, claim 1 is patentable over Nuding and Taira. Claims 2-4 and 7-11 are dependent upon claim 1 and are patentable over Nuding and Taira for at least the reasons advanced with respect to claim 1. Claims 12-14 and 17-18 include features similar to those discussed above with reference to claim 1 and are patentable over Nuding and Taira for at least the reasons advanced with respect to claim 1.

Claims 7, 8 and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Nuding in view of Taira and Watanabe. Watanabe was relied upon for teaching features of the base receiver, but does not cure the deficiencies of Nuding with respect to the receive branch networks. Thus, claims 7, 8 and 17 are patentable over Nuding in view of Taira and Watanabe.

Claims 10 and 19 were rejected were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Nuding in view of Taira and Solondz. Solondz was relied upon for teaching an unequal number of transmit and receive branches, but does not cure the deficiencies of Nuding with respect to the receive branch networks. Thus, claims 10 and 19 are patentable over Nuding in view of Taira and Solondz.

In view of the foregoing remarks and amendments, Applicant submits that the above-identified application is now in condition for allowance. Early notification to this effect is respectfully requested.

If there are any charges with respect to this response or otherwise, please charge them to Deposit Account 06-1130 maintained by Applicant's attorneys.

Respectfully submitted,

By: 

David A. Fox  
Registration No. 38,807  
CANTOR COLBURN LLP  
55 Griffin Road South  
Bloomfield, CT 06002  
Telephone (860) 286-2929  
Facsimile (860) 286-0115  
Customer No. 36192

Date: February 3, 2004